



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

dk

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/038,891	01/02/2002	Jeffrey T. Borenstein	62030(51588)	8813
21874	7590	04/04/2006		
EDWARDS & ANGELL, LLP P.O. BOX 55874 BOSTON, MA 02205			EXAMINER NAFF, DAVID M	
			ART UNIT 1651	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 04/04/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/038,891	BORENSTEIN ET AL.	
	Examiner David M. Naff	Art Unit 1651	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 January 2006.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,2 and 5-38 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 27 and 33-37 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1,2,5-26,28-32 and 38 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

A response of 1/4/06 presented arguments and did not amend the claims.

Claims in the application are 1, 2 and 5-38.

5 Claims 27 and 33-37 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in the reply filed on 7/21/04.

10 Claims examined on the merits are 1, 2, 5-26, 28-32 and 38.

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 1, 2, 5-26, 28-32 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 15 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weiss et al (6,143,293) in view of Vacanti et al (6,139,574) and Mastrangelo et al (6,136,212), and if necessary in further view of Cima et al (5,518,680) or Marra et al (6,165,486).

20 The claims are drawn to a multilayer device containing a first layer of a micromachined polymer scaffold for attachment and culturing of cells and containing a pattern of microchannels, and a second layer of a micromachined polymer scaffold for attachment and culturing of cells, and the first and second layers being fastened together.

25 Weiss et al disclose a scaffold containing multiple layers fastened together. Weiss et al further disclose the scaffold

Art Unit: 1651

containing microchannels to help support angiogenesis and to support cell growth (col 4, lines 52-56).

Vacanti et al disclose a scaffold for tissue regeneration containing interconnected pores.

5 Mastrangelo et al disclose producing microfluidic devices containing micromachined microchannels.

It would have been obvious to provide layers of the scaffold of Weiss et al with interconnecting micromachined microchannels for cell growth as suggested by Weiss et al disclosing microchannels to support 10 angiogenesis and cell growth and Vacanti et al disclosing a scaffold having interconnected pores for cell growth and Mastrangelo et al disclosing producing microfluidic devices having micromachined microchannels. Micromachined microchannels in the scaffold of Weiss et al would have been expected to be advantageous for the same reason 15 that Weiss et al found microchannels to be advantageous, i. e. to support angiogenesis and to support cell growth. Providing microchannels about 10 to 50 microns in diameter as in claim 38 would have been a matter of obvious choice depending on the size of cells desired to enter the channels, and would have been a matter of 20 individual preference well within the skill of the art. If needed, Cima et al or Marra et al would have further suggested scaffold structure. The conditions of dependent claims would have been matters of obvious choice in view of the disclosures of the references. The methods of claims 25, 26 and 28-32 would have been obvious methods of

Art Unit: 1651

making the scaffold in view of the methods disclosed by the references.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 1/4/06 have been fully considered but
5 they are not persuasive.

Applicants point out what each reference discloses, and how the reference differs from the invention. However, the references are applied in combination, and the invention becomes obvious when the references are considered together as a whole rather than each alone.

10 Contrary to applicants' assertion, Weiss et al is not related to only to macroscale features. Weiss et al disclose forming microchannels to help support angiogenesis and to support cell growth (col 4, lines 52-56). It would have been obvious to from these microchannels by micromachining as suggested by Mastrangelo et al.

15 Applicants urge that there is no suggestion in Mastrangelo et al to form a 3D structure, and the polymers are etched, not molded.

However, Mastrangelo et al consider the etching to be micromachining. The term "micromachined" is broad and is not limited to only molding.

See U.S. Patent 5,264,075 (abstract, line 3) that recites "chemically 20 etched (micromachined), and (col 1, lines 46-47) "chemically etching ("micromachining"). A 3D structure is suggested by Weiss et al.

Microfabrication is clearly suggested by Weiss et al and Mastrangelo et al by disclosing microchannels and devices having micromachined microchannels. It would have been clearly obvious to provide the

Art Unit: 1651

scaffold of Weiss et al with micromachined microchannels for their function as suggested by Weiss et al and Mastrangelo et al.

It is granted as urged by applicants that Vacanti et al is not micromachining. However, Vacanti et al is combined with the Weiss et 5 al and Mastrangelo et al references, which suggest microchannels and micromachining.

Applicants refer to paragraph 196 of the specification as demonstrating a resolution of 2 μm . However, the present claims do not require a micromachined polymer scaffold produced as in paragraph 10 196 of the specification. As to microchannels of about 10 to 50 microns in diameter as required by claim 38, the scaffold of Weiss et al can contain pores of 200-400 microns (col 2, line 60) and the matrix of Vacanti et al can have pores of 5-80 microns (col 15, line 39) or 10-20 microns (col 12, line 61) and channels of 60-300 microns 15 (col 17, line 18). Thus, it would have been apparent to the ordinary skilled artisan that pore size can vary, and will depend on preferred size desired for a particular use or cell size to enter the scaffold. The specification discloses that channel size can be 5-500 microns (paragraph 78), and no critically has been established in using a 20 channel size of 10-50 microns. The specification discloses that this channel size is merely a size for endothelial cells to enter. Weiss et al disclose that current approaches use a type of scaffold material to promote one type cell growth. When the cell type is endothelial cells, it would have been obvious to select a channel size for these 25 cells instead of for bone cells as in Weiss et al. Selecting a

Art Unit: 1651

particular channel size merely because the size allows a certain cell to enter would have been obvious and within the ordinary skill of the art.

Conclusion

5 **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date 10 of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, 15 however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David M. Naff whose telephone number is 571-272-0920. The examiner can normally be 20 reached on Monday-Friday 9:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mike Wityshyn can be reached on 571-272-0926. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1651

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for 5 unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

10



David M. Naff
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1651

DMN
4/1/06